R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 013 080

JC 670 610

A STUDY OF MERIT PAY AND EVALUATION AS THEY RELATE TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AT COLLEGE OF MARIN.

BY- MELONE, R.J.

PUB DATE 18 MAY 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.00 75P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, SALARIES, *MERIT RATING PROGRAMS, *EVALUATION, EVALUATION NEEDS, *ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, EVALUATION METHODS, KENTFIELD, CALIFORNIA,

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES REQUESTED THAT A STAFF COMMITTEE INVESTIGATE THE QUESTION OF WHETHER MERIT PAY OR SYSTEMATIC EVALUATIVE PROGRAMS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AT THE COLLEGE OF MARIN. THE COMMITTEE REVIEWED THE LITERATURE WHICH EDUCATION AND INDUSTRY HAVE PRODUCED ON THE SUBJECT AND ALSO CONDUCTED A SURVEY OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY AT THE COLLEGE OF MARIN AND OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS AT 18 OTHER CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES. THE COMMITTEE CONCLUDED THAT 1) A MERIT PAY PROGRAM WOULD NOT BE A SATISFACTORY INCENTIVE TO BETTER ADMINISTRATIVE PERFORMANCE, AND 2) A SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION PROGRAM COULD BE OF GREAT VALUE BUT SHOULD BE CAREFULLY STUDIED BEFORE BEING IMPLEMENTED. (RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ARE INCLUDED. ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF MERIT PAY AND SYSTEMATIC EVALUATIVE PROGRAMS ARE DISCUSSED IN DETAIL.) (AD)

ED013080

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ERIC

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 28 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

A STUDY OF

MERIT PAY AND EVALUATION

AS THEY RELATE TO THE

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

AT

COLLEGE OF MARIN

Prepared for the
Board of Trustees
Marin Junior College District
Kentfield, California

by

R. J. Melone
May 18, 1967

IC 670 610

C O N T E N T S

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

SOME RELATED CONCEPTS OF MERIT PAY AND EVALUATION

- Merit Pay
- Evaluation

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

- Merit Pay
- Systematic Evaluation
- Other Possible Incentives
- Junior College Leadership Students' Reactions

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Merit Pay
  - Recommendations
- Systematic Evaluation
  - Recommendations
- Other Incentives
- Summary

APPENDIX

- A. Questionnaire to Junior College Presidents
- B. Questionnaire to Marin Administrators and Faculty
- C. Questions for Interview with Junior College Leadership Students and Responses
- D. Responses to Merit Pay Questions (2 x 2 Comparison Tables)
- E. Responses to Evaluation Questions (2 x 2 Test Tables)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHARTS AND GRAPHS

Chart No. 1 Reaction of College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty to Merit Pay for Administrators

C O N T E N T S

CHARTS AND GRAPHS (continued)

Chart No. 2 Response of College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty to Merit Pay as Incentive to Better Administrative Performance

Chart No. 3 Approval or Disapproval of College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty of Establishing Merit Pay for Administrators

Chart No. 4 Reaction of College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty to Making Systematic Evaluation a Part of Merit Pay for Administrators

Chart No. 5 Who Should Administer Merit Pay for Administrators According to College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty

Chart No. 6 Rating of Current College of Marin Administrator's Salary Schedule by College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty

Chart No. 7 Comparison of Administrative Salary Schedules College of Marin and Seven California Junior Colleges which Participated in the Study

Chart No. 8 Approval or Disapproval of California Junior College Presidents of Establishing Merit Pay for Administrators

Chart No. 9 Rating by California Junior College Presidents of the Administrators' Salary Schedule Currently in Effect at their College

Chart No. 10 Reaction of College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty to Systematic Evaluation of College of Marin Administrative Staff

Chart No. 11 Response of College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty to Systematic Evaluation as Encouragement or Discouragement to College of Marin Administrators

Chart No. 12 Approval or Disapproval of College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty of Systematic Evaluation of the Administrative Staff

Chart No. 13 Who Should Administer a Systematic Evaluation of Administrative Staff According to College of Marin Administrators and Faculty

Chart No. 14 Rank Order of Incentives as Perceived by California Junior Colleges Chief Administrators, and College of Marin Faculty and Administrators

Chart No. 15 Responses of Junior College Leadership Students to Working Under and Administering Merit Pay and Systematic Evaluation Program

INTRODUCTION

In July, 1966, the Board of Trustees of the College of Marin approved a new salary schedule for administrators which represented a substantial increase (about 10-12%) for all administrative positions. This generous increment made the schedule, in the opinion of the Board, much more competitive with other junior colleges in the Bay area and in the state. The Board attached one proviso to its approval, however, charging the administrative staff to "...examine merit pay and evaluation as they relate to the administrative staff and present the findings and recommendations to the Board." Such a study was conducted and on May 25, 1966, a reported was submitted. It stated:

> The staff has surveyed articles and books on merit rating, merit pay, and incentive programs in industry, business, and education. The literature is full of detailed discussions of programs which have failed, programs which seemingly are successful, and the pro's and con's of merit rating and merit pay as they relate to teachers. Little has been written about merit pay programs for administrators in education; most programs concern themselves with management in industry.[1]

The staff included a recommendation that it meet with a subcommittee of the Board, and emphasized:

> At this time the staff is neither for nor against merit pay—the literature points out both advantages and disadvantages. The literature stresses the need for each district to study merit pay for itself, and, if it desires, construct a plan according to its own needs, climate, and ability to pay.
>
> It is, therefore, the opinion of the administrative staff that greatest benefits for the district can be achieved through study of a merit pay program. The outcome of such a study would dictate succeeding steps.[2]

---

[1] Administrative Staff, College of Marin. Merit Pay Proposal, submitted to the Board of Trustees, May 25, 1966.

[2] Ibid

Subsequently, the staff did meet with a subcommittee of the Board and it was agreed that a "thorough study of a merit pay program" should be conducted. This report is therefore submitted as a response to this mandate.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Discussions about merit pay and evaluation of personnel in all levels of education are never at a standstill. It would seem there is a constant murmur about such programs, and, intermittently a peak period of interest in which an intense examination of possibilities is required. Generally, the issue centers around incentive awards to faculty, with three objectives in the minds of those individuals or groups proposing such a program: 1) recognition of individual initiative, 2) instructional improvement, and 3) the recruitment and retention of superior teachers.[3]

Despite the number of individual studies in specific institutions and districts, as well as a few pieces of research which were more broadly based, there is no consensus on the topic other than to acknowledge that it is an intricate and thorny issue. Also, programs of merit pay with accompanying systematic evaluation were not found to be numerous and are generally held in disfavor by all the parties involved. This negative reaction, it seems, is occasioned by the personal bias, subjectivity, and administrative detail and paper work involved in any program. Opponents maintain that the program results in a breakdown of faculty morale, greater conformity, loss of professional cooperation, and the potential elimination of salary schedules with a concomittent threat to security. Further, they maintain, it is not reasonable to equate industry and education; and incidentally, industry has its own doubts about the value of merit pay and ratings.

Advocates of merit pay respond to these comments by stating that administrators can readily identify good teachers (and do so quite often for illustrative purposes), that high salaries will attract people of higher

---

[3]James P. Steffensen. Merit Salary Programs, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962, p. 8.

calibre, that superior teachers should not be paid the same as average or inferior teachers, merit pay would eliminate "moonlighting," and such a system would result in better support for the schools.[4]

Most of the discussion, it should be emphasized, deals with the issue as it relates to the K-12 public school program, with very little concentration on or pertinence to the college level. The lock-step system of faculty salary schedules, with specified increments between steps and levels, in some ways mitigates the concept of merit pay; and, the tenure policy in higher education greatly minimizes the rationale for constant evaluation of faculty. More could, and will, be said about these two related areas. <u>However, this report examines the thornier and less frequently raised issue of merit pay for and systematic evaluation of administrative personnell in higher education, speciffically at the College of Marin</u>.

---

[4]John Bright. News report on special study for CTA.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

In order to remain consistent throughout the report, several definitions were set down which have pertained for the course of the study.

Merit Pay - a procedure for differentiating salaries on the basis of demonstrated performance in relation to the functions assigned to the individual [administrator]

Additional pay for an additional assignment or for a different position does not qualify, under the definition, as merit pay; thus, a merit award of additional salary based on some evaluation or rating system. Therefore, the second definition required is:

Evaluation - a systematic means of determining the performance level of an administrator in relation to his specific assignment, and colleagues with similar duties.

Administrator - a person in the junior college whose position is not directly related to an academic department, who does not have tenure prerogatives, and is answerable for his responsibilities either directly to the chief administrator or to a dean.

The procedure followed in this study consisted of several parts in order to encompass the diverse and complex nature of the problem and to overcome the lack of current information on the subject. It should be understood, however, that no attempt was made to conduct a broad-scale study which would bring massive amounts of data to bear upon the subject. The first step, then, was to examine literature regarding the subject, both in the field of education which proved spares and in writings about business and industry. This included the report of the College of Marin administrative staff as well as some duplication of the material they had covered.

Secondly, in order to verify the opinion that the program of merit

pay and systematic evaluation in relation to administrators was relatively non-existent and to gather opinions, two separate questionnaires were prepared. One was distributed to 18 chief administrators of junior colleges throughout the state. These institutions were selected from a sample stratified by geographic region, size, and socio-economic factors. The second questionnaire was administered at the College of Marin. This procedure seemed especially appropriate for these will be the persons most directly affected by such a program should it be adopted by the Board. All eleven members of the administrative team and eleven (a 10 per cent random sample) of the faculty responded to the questionnaire. The sample size of the faculty was chosen in order to assure equal numbers in faculty and administrative groups for greater ease of comparison.

One more area of concern associated with the adoption of such a program seemed to be the long run implications of attracting and retaining the high calibre administrators desired by the Board and the people of the district. Accordingly, interviews were conducted with ten students involved in the Junior College Leadership Program at the University of California (Berkeley). This group seemed appropriate to the study for its members have demonstrated an obvious interest in administrative careers, have had experience in higher education, and are pursuing programs (including doctoral degrees) which are designed to prepare them for junior college administration in particular. Five of the candidates interviewed are currently in the process of writing dissertations and will enter the field sometime after June, 1967, and five of the candidates are at varying stages in the program.

SOME RELATED CONCEPTS OF MERIT PAY AND EVALUATION

Since it was the express desire of the College of Marin Board of Trustees to examine merit pay and evaluation as unified elements of a single plan, it seems necessary to pull these two concepts together. Before doing so, however, it may be best to comment briefly on each one as separate entities, and then unite them, according to some of the literature studied. Since there is very limited evidence from studies in education, information from business and industry has also been a primary source in the following statements.

Merit Pay

The idea of formal merit pay began basically with the "piece work" approach to production. The more the worker could produce, the more he received for his effort, and less capable performers settled for lower wages or else accellerated their output to gain increases. It's zenith was probably epitomized by the Lincoln plan[5] which received considerable attention in the late 1930's and early 1940's. However, managers and executives could not be rewarded in quite the same manner and various other "incentives" were devised for them. These include stock options, bonuses, cars, country club memberships, increased expense accounts, homes, and a variety of other devices. These same means, of course, are used to "lure" executives from other firms.

Financial rewards, however, have not brought about desired results it seems, even on the executive level. The researchers who contributed reports compiled by Whisler and Harper[6] verify this thought and are substantiated

---

[5]James F. Lincoln, Lincoln's Incentive System, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1946. (Lincoln explains in this book his concept of "incentive management" and the manner which it spurred all members of the firm to better efforts.)

[6]Thomas Whisler and Shirley Harper (eds.), Performance Appraisal New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1962.

by Wolf,[7] Sibson,[8] and most graphically by Newman, who preceded them with this remark:

> Several studies of human motivation have shown that the use of financial income as an incentive has been overrated; there are other considerations that may be more important in some circumstances.[9]

What those other "considerations" could be will be discussed later, but Newman also points out:

> By far the most common financial incentive is the possibility of a permanent increase in pay while remaining in the same position, or an increase in pay that accompanies promotion.[10]

All are agreed that the basic salary is really the important issue at hand. In and of itself, the pay scale must be at a level which honestly rewards the talents of the individual and will attract the type of executives desired.

Evaluation

The systematic evaluation of performance, or merit-rating (not to be confused with merit pay) as it is often called in business and industry, receives strong support from the authors already noted. They take considerable pains to point out the many difficulties involved, however, in this very touchy area of "playing God", as one author calls it. Wolf, for example warns against using the same plan "...for wage administration as is used for coaching and appraisal or for work force adjustments."[11] He

---

[7]William B. Wolf, The Management of Personnel. San Francisco: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1961.

[8]Robert,E. Sibson, "Plan for Management Salary Administration," in Management of the Personnel Function. (Heckmann and Huneryager eds.). Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1962, pp. 340-364.

[9]William H. Newman, Administrative Action. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956, p. 449.

[10]Newman, p. 450.

[11]Wolf, p. 218.

stated:

> There is a tendency at present to regard it [merit-rating] more as a technique for improving communications and building esprit de corps—that is, as an aspect of coaching and appraisal.[12]

The evaluation function in education, however, becomes increasingly complex and there is no need here to belabor the issue of faculty evaluation as it pertains to retention, tenure, promotion, and salary. This has been a long-standing cause for debate in academic circles as the faculty strive for "professionalism" and resist the "routinization" of their activities with bureaucratic norms of measurement. Such attitudes have resulted in what has been termed by many students of organization as a "mixed model"[13] with a form of "representative bureaucracy" introduced into colleges and universities. This kind of informal and less rigidly structured type of organization tends, then, to extend the quandary about faculty evaluation into the realm of administrator evaluation.

The administrator must meet the faculty on a "colleague" or co-professional type of relationship as he attempts to implement policy in the areas of responsibility delegated to him. With the increased faculty role in the decision-making process, especially intensified recently in the junior colleges and as embraced by the College of Marin Board of Trustees,[14] the administrator cannot act in a bureaucratic manner. That is, he cannot issue directives which he can then assume will be carried out without question

---

[12] Wolf, p. 217.

[13] H. Vollmer, "Professionals and Organizations," in a lecture at Stanford Research Institute, Palo Alto, Calif., July 12, 1966, explored the means by which organizational forms could be revised and mixed in order to achieve the goals of the enterprise and permit greater freedom to the professional talents of its staff.

[14] College of Marin Administrative Regulations in process of revision.

by virtue of his position in the hierarchy. Rather, he must call upon special skills in interpersonal relations in his dealings with faculty and still not desert his responsibility for the eventual decision to be made and the consequences of his actions. Built into this entire concept are the special qualities required of an administrator; the qualities which must be evaluated and which defy measurement by check-lists or objective charts. Simon, for instance, points out that "...in a strict sense, the administrator's decisions cannot be evaluated by scientific means."[15]

Despite the aforementioned difficulties and concerns evaluation is a generally accepted concept in business and industry. A wide range of procedures—from very informal to very formal—have been adopted, with varying degrees of success. These will be discussed later in this report along with a further examination of the implications of a systematic program of evaluation and its relations to merit pay.

---

[15]Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior. New York: The Free Press, 1957, p. 47.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The opinions compiled from the readings which were summarized in the preceding section are voiced by students of business and industrial management. It is not a simple procedure to translate what has been adopted by business into terms and procedures acceptable by the academic community—or the "professional" in any field of endeavor. In fact, there is a growing body of literature discussing the relationship between the "professional" and the organization.[16]

In order to particularize the ideas offered by researchers on this topic, and to make it meaningful in relation to the College of Marin, questionnaires were administered to all 11 members of the administrative team, and to 11 (10% random sample) of the faculty. (See Appendix A for questionnaire.)

A similar questionnaire somewhat different in wording and arrangement, was sent to 18 junior college chief administrators, with 14 responses which are included in this report (see Appendix B for questionnaire).

Merit Pay

The responses indicate that merit pay is generally unacceptable to both administrators and faculty at the College of Marin. In both groups, five of 11 termed merit pay as "undesirable," while three additional administrators and four additional faculty members marked it as "highly undesirable." By collapsing the two responses and combining the groups, the two "undesirable" categories were marked by 17 our of 22 respon-

---

[16]Reference in this area can be drawn from S. Marcson, The Scientist in American Industry, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, Industrial Relations Section, 1960; William Kornhauser, Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodation, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963; H. W. Vollmer, A Preliminary Investigation of the Role of Scientists in Research Organizations, Boston Mass.: Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, 1963, and others.

dents (see Chart No. 1).

Chart No. 1

Reaction of College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty to Merit Pay for Administrators

(N = Administrators - 11; Faculty - 11)

	Admin.	Faculty	Total
Highly desirable	0	0	0
Desirable	2	2	4
Undesirable	5	5	10
Highly undesirable	3	4	7
Indifferent	1	0	1
Total	11	11	22

As to merit pay serving as an "incentive to better administrative performance," seven of 11 administrators responded with "no" and eight of 11 faculty registered a similarly negative response (see Chart No. 2).

Chart No. 2

Response of College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty to Merit Pay as Incentive to Better Administrative Performance

(N = Administrators - 11; Faculty - 11)

	Admin.	Faculty	Total
Yes	1	3	4
No	7	8	15
Qualified	3	0	3
Total	11	11	22

It is equally apparent from the responses that both groups would "disapprove" of "establishing merit pay for administrators." Eight of the 11 administrators and 10 of 11 faculty disapproved (see Chart No. 3).

Chart No. 3

Approval or Disapproval of College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty of Establishing Merit Pay for Administrators

(N = Administrators - 11; Faculty - 11)

	Admin.	Faculty	Total
Approve	2	1	3
Disapprove	8	10	18
No response	1	0	1
Total	11	11	22

Regardless of these attitudes, both groups were unanimous in stating that systematic evaluation should be a part of a merit pay program for administrators if such a program is initiated (see Chart No. 4).

Chart No. 4

Reaction of College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty to Making Systematic Evaluation a Part of Merit Pay for Administrators

(N = Administrators - 11; Faculty - 11)

	Admin.	Faculty	Total
Yes	11	11	22
No	0	0	0
No response	0	0	0
Total	11	11	22

The administration of merit pay program produced no clear-cut agreement as to what person or what group should be responsible. The chief administrator was named by four administrators and three faculty; but, the greatest number of both groups together, 14, specified some form of joint administration of president, board, faculty and students to carry out the allocation of merit pay (see Chart No. 5).

Chart No. 5

Who Should Administer Merit Pay for Administrators
According to College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty

(N = Administrators - 11; Faculty - 11)

	Admin.	Faculty	Total
Chief Administrator	4	3	7
Board of Trustees	0	0	0
Faculty Committee	1	0	1
Other or combination	6	8	14
Total	11	11	22

Nine administrators felt the current administrative salary schedule was "competitive" while only two felt it was not. The faculty, on the other hand, were not so clear cut. Five marked it as "competitive," one marked it "not competitive," and five acknowledged that they did not know if it was or was not (see Chart No. 6).

Chart No. 6

Rating of Current College of Marin Administrator's Salary Schedule by College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty

(N = Administrators - 11; Faculty - 11)

	Admin.	Faculty	Total
Highly Competitive	0	0	0
Not Competitive	2	1	3
Competitive	9	5	14
Don't Know	0	5	5
Total	11	11	22

The question of competiveness in salary schedules is a difficult one to reconcile. The schedules of seven of the other junior colleges which participated in the study were checked, but all are structured differently from each other and from the College of Marin. However, to try to put this question in some perspective a careful effort was made in each case to relate the seven schedules to that of Marin. The results (see Chart No. 7) show that they are all reasonable close together in most categories. Salaries of chief administrators were not included since they were not the subjects of this study.

It is clear that the responding junior college presidents also reacted negatively to the concept of merit pay. Nine of 14 registered "disapprove," three "approve," and two failed to check it at all (see Chart No. 8).

The presidents also felt the administrative salary schedules at their institutions were competitive in all but one of the 14 colleges (see Chart No. 9).

Chart No. 7

Comparison of Administrative Salary Schedules College of Marin and Seven California Junior Colleges which Participated in the Study

Positions	Marin	College A	College B	College C	College D	College E	College F	College G
I Vice President	19,500- 21,000			22,500				
II Senior Dean	19,500- 20,000			19,250- 20,750				16,322- 19,609
III Deans	17,500- 19,000	16,280- 18,380	17,600- 19,600	19,000- 20,500	16,250- 18,250	15,480- 19,470	17,000- 18,000	15,233- 18,344
Direct. of Planning & Research								
Business Manager								
IV Associate Deans	16,500- 18,000	16,000- 18,100		17,500- 18,500			16,000- 17,000	13,057- 17,079
V Assistant Deans	15,500- 17,000	15,650- 17,750	15,600- 17,600	16,000- 17,000	14,250- 16,250	13,700- 17,690	15,550- 16,000	11,969- 14,549
Dist. Supervisor of Const. & Plant Operation								
V Adm. Assistant 4	15,500- 17,000			15,500- 16,500	14,250- 16,250	13,700- 17,690		
3	14,750- 16,250							
2	14,000- 15,500							
1	10,500- 12,000		10,400- 12,400					

Chart No. 8

Approval or Disapproval of California Junior College Presidents of Establishing Merit Pay for Administrators

(N = 14)

	Chief Admin.	Total with Administrators & Faculty
Approve	3	6
Disapprove	9	27
No response	2	3
Total	14	36

Chart No. 9

Rating by California Junior College Presidents of the Administrators' Salary Schedule Currently in Effect at their College

(N = 14)

	Chief Admin.	Total with Administrators & Faculty
Highly Competitive	0	0
Not Competitive	1	4
Competitive	13	27
Don't Know	0	5
Total	14	36

In summation, then, there seems to be considerable agreement among the chief administrators, administrators, and faculty who responded to the opinionaire in a negative reaction to the concept of merit pay for administrators. This attitude was reinforced by statements from the respondents which generally pointed out that merit pay might "...lead to internal morale problems,"

that it "...would engender hard feelings," or "...it would be difficult to administer," and "...all should merit merit pay or be replaced." This latter point was emphasized with the reminder that "...administrators do not have tenure."

Not to be overlooked, however, is the fact that six of the 36 respondents favored a merit pay program. There several reasons in general, were "...an outstanding job should be recognized," that "...creativity and initiative should be rewarded," or "...it develops individual responsibility and brings recognition," and one president pointed out that he felt it (merit pay) necessary "...if we are to break the lock-step of equal pay for everyone regardless of the quality of the work they do."

Systematic Evaluation

The near-unanimity of opinions regarding merit pay is not apparent in the responses to a program of systematic evaluation of administrators. In general, there is a majority opinion favoring some procedure, but there are some apparent misgivings about the methods to be followed in relation to the benefits to be derived.

Six of the College of Marin administrators checked that evaluation would be "desirable" and three indicated it would be "highly desirable," of the 11 respondents to the opinionaire. The faculty, however, was not so strongly disposed. Although six of them marked either "desirable" or "highly desirable," four checked "undesirable" and one selected "highly undesirable" for a scant 6-5 majority reaction. Clearly, the two groups are not in close accord on this aspect, even though there is better than a 2-1 ratio indicating some degree of "desirability" when the totals are considered (see Chart No. 10).

Chart No. 10

Reaction of College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty to Systematic Evaluation of College of Marin Administrative Staff

(N = Administrators - 11; Faculty - 11)

	Admin.	Faculty	Total
Highly Desirable	3	1	4
Desirable	6	5	11
Undesirable	1	4	5
Highly Undesirable	1	1	2
Indifferent	0	0	0
Total	11	11	22

The possible effects of systematic evaluation on the morale of administrators drew faculty and administrators somewhat closer together. Five of 11 administrators and five of 11 faculty felt such a program would "encourage" administrators; three administrators and four faculty indicated that it would "discourage," and five members of the two groups either made no response or qualified their response. Thus, when totals of both segments of the college are examined the vote is a 10-7 expression of "encouragement," but the five "no responses" or qualified answers make acceptance of this balance difficult (see Chart No. 11).

Chart No. 11

Response of College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty to Systematic Evaluation as Encouragement or Discouragement to College of Marin Administrators

(N = Administrators - 11; Faculty - 11)

	Admin.	Faculty	Total
Encourage	5	5	10
Discourage	3	4	7
No or qualified response	3	2	5
Total	11	11	22

In the matter of actual approval or disapproval of systematic evaluation, a difference between administrators and faculty can again be noted. Seven of 11 administrators "approve," three "disapprove" and one qualified his response. The faculty gave only a one vote majority to "approve" over "disapprove" with a 6-5 vote. When combined, the two segments register a total of 13 "approve," eight "disapprove" and one qualified response (see Chart No. 12).

Only three of the 14 chief administrators noted that their institutions

Chart No. 12

Approval or Disapproval of College of Marin Administrative Staff and Faculty of Systematic Evaluation of the Administrative Staff

(N = Administrators - 11; Faculty - 11)

	Admin.	Faculty	Total
Approve	7	6	13
Disapprove	3	5	8
No or qualified response	1	0	1
Total	11	11	22

already had "a systematic means of evaluating administrative staff." Of these three, two conducted the evaluation and one shared the duty with a committee. All three felt that the program was (1) efficient, (2) effective, and (3) built morale. Further, they would not drop the program and would encourage other schools to adopt a program of systematic evaluation. Incidentally, only one used some kind of evaluation form.

From the 11 chief administrators whose colleges did not already have a systematic evaluation program, the following reactions were obtained: (1) six of them have considered such a program, (2) four are still considering such a program, and (3) four would like to start such a program.

As to the problem of conducting a program of systematic evaluation, four of the 11 college presidents who do not currently have an evaluation system selected the chief administrator as the responsible person, five preferred a committee representative of various segments within the college, and two failed to respond. The administrators and faculty of the College of Marin were also divided in their suggestions as to the person or group most appropriate to conduct the program. Four of the 11 administrators and

three of the 11 faculty named the chief administrator, while seven administrators and eight faculty felt some representative committee should be assigned the responsibility (see Chart No. 13).

Chart No. 13

Who Should Administer a Systematic Evaluation of Administrative Staff According to College of Marin Administrators and Faculty

(N = Administrators - 11; Faculty - 11)

	Admin.	Faculty	Total
Chief Administrator	4	3	7
Board of Trustees	0	0	0
Faculty Committee	0	0	0
Other or Combination	7	8	15
Total	11	11	22

It is difficult to make a flat comment on the results of the opinionaire as it relates to the question of evaluation of the administrative staff. The figures demonstrate a general consensus which favors such a program, but the chief administrators and administrators showed no over-whelming mandate for systematic evaluation and faculty were almost evenly divided. A larger sample would perhaps have permitted a clearer distinction and possibly more observable differences between and among the three segments polled. It is, however, reasonable to assume that the general pattern of responses would obtain with a larger sample.

Reactions to open-ended requests for opinion on the subject helps somewhat in making an interpretation that shows general favor for systematic evaluation for those who approved appeared to be willing to state their reasons. Some of the favorable comments included:

Chief Administrators

...important that every person knows where he stands

...increases effectiveness

...should be done yearly

...healthy for college

Administrators

...improve understanding between administrators

...would force examination and clarification of functions... make people "answerable."

...would probably improve quality of work

...administrator needs to know the reaction of others toward him, extent of support.

Faculty

...may serve as a basis for promotion, further training

...an objective look...is constructive

...evaluation...has always (1) been painful, (2) caused growth, (3) caused increased efficiency and confidence

...administrator would feel in closer touch with faculty and colleagues

Some of the unfavorable reactions were:

Chief Administrators

...a formalized system (contributes) to additional paperwork

...until done instution-wide, don't want to single out group already under fire

Administrators

...too many problems involved in a fair, unbiased and equitable administration

...should be considered for (tenured) faculty and administration alike

Faculty

...Politics...we have too much of it

...will discrimminate in favor of the "spectacular" and punish the "methodical" but good administrator

...wonder if [it] would be really objective

Criteria for Evaluation

Regardless of opinions held on systematic evaluation of administrators every respondent had some criteria to recommend upon which to base such evaluation. There was considerable consistency between the groups as well as among them, and although each respondent was permitted to phrase them in his own way, some effort has been made to summarize them under several major headings:

Professional Ability

...background and preparation

...as related to job description

...efficiency and effectiveness

...growth on the job

...delegation without undue interference

...follow through with responsibilities

Communications

...is clear in his presentations and receptive to others comments and ideas

...accepts suggestions and criticism

Human Relations

...establishes rapport with faculty, students, fellow administrators

...socially adept

...understands the responsibilities of other segments of the colleges

...is sympathetic...empathetic

...has a good public image

Commitment and Loyalty

...commitment to the community college

...loyal to the institution and his colleagues

...reliable and accountable

Leadership Ability

...has initiative

...coordinates well and gives direction

...creative in his own activities and recommendations

...adaptable...reacts to new situations and new solutions

...stimulates all segments of the college

...innovative in his approach to old and new problems

...objective in decision-making

...personal strength, character, bearing

...cooperative but independent

Other Possible Incentives

The literature on incentives in business and industry indicated that there is a growing awareness that financial incentives are overated,[17] as mentioned earlier in this report. In order to determine if this is equally true in the junior college, the persons polled were asked:

> What incentives, in your professional opinion, best motivate members of the administrative staff? (Responses rated on a 1, 2, 3, etc., priority.)

The list of alternative incentives offered were taken from (Newman)[18] who had developed them primarily for industry. They are listed below, and are ranked under the heading of each group according to the priorities given:

Chart No. 14

Rank Order of Incentives as Perceived by California Junior Colleges Chief Administrators, and College of Marin Faculty and Administrators

Incentives	Chief Administrators	Marin Administrators	Marin Faculty	Combined Rank
Higher Financial Income	5	7	1	5
Social Status and Respect	4	5	2	4
Security	8	6	7	7
Attractive Work and Environment	1	8	6	8
Opportunity for Development	2	1	3	1
Worthwhile Activity	3	2	5	2
Personal Power and Influence	7	9	8	6
Voice in Own Affairs	6	3	4	3
Just and Diligent Supervision	9	4	9	9

[17] Newman, p. 449
[18] Newman, p. 449

According to statistical theory, the differences between those ranked most important and those ranked least important would remain relatively constant if a larger sample were drawn. Thus, the rank order for each segment is sufficiently different to show that each views the question of incentives for administrators somewhat differently. For example, and apart from motives for the moment, chief administrators and faculty did not feel 'just and diligent supervision' was much of an incentive; but, the administrators placed it number four in their priority list. As to "security," though, all three groups showed their awareness of the non-tenured role of the administrator, and one wag even noted "what security?" In apparent confirmation of the findings in industry, however, "financial income" did not receive a high priority from the administrators themselves although faculty placed it number one on behalf of the administrators.

What is probably most significant is the 1-2-3 priority given by administrators to what they feel would be the best motivating incentives: "opportunity for development," "worthwhile activity," and "voice in own affairs." These three, in relation to their placement of "just and diligent supervision" as number four, offer some important clues for a program of systematic evaluation and its underlying philosophy.

Junior College Leadership Students' Reactions

The responses fo ten students in the Junior College Leadership Program at the University of California (Berkeley) should warrant serious considerations in a discussion pertaining to administrators rewards and evaluation. These are, after all, the candidates for positions which will be opening up in the near future. Accordingly, two questions were posed to each one during a brief interview, conducted singly, and subsequently written up and verified by each interviewee. The questions were:

1. Would you apply for a position on the administrative staff of

a junior college where a merit pay program based upon a systematic evaluation procedure was in effect?

2. Would you apply for the position of president of a junior college where the Board of Trustees would require that the president administer a merit pay program based upon a systematic evaluation procedure?

It should be kept in mind that the ten persons interviewed were of different ages, quite varied backgrounds, and many of them occupied either administrative or teaching positions in various junior colleges at the time of the interviews. Although their responsives could be a "yes" or "no," and even "qualified" yes or no, each was also asked to elaborate upon such a direct response. Their statements, in full, are reproduced in Appendix C.

Chart No. 15 shows that five of the ten leadership candidates would be willing to apply for administrative posts under a merit pay and evaluation system, while only one of their colleagues flatly stated "no," and four qualified their responses. The division of opinion, however, was not nearly so pronounced in the question of administering such a program as chief administrator. In this regard, five said "yes," four said "no," and one blunted his answer with qualification.

Chart No. 15

Responses of Junior College Leadership Students to Working Under and Administering Merit Pay and Systematic Evaluation Program

(N = 10)

	Question 1 As Administrator	Question 2 As Chief Administrator
Yes	5	5
No	1	4
Qualified	4	1
Total	10	10

It was rather obvious throughout the interviews that there, indeed, was a fairly consistent pattern among these future administrators: more sure of their potential to succeed, geared to the "organization man" concept but very aware of the "academic" organization as different from business and industrial organization, alert to the pressures exerted on various persons within the college, willing to take risks, each showing varying degrees of self-confidence, and all of them demonstrating a "professional" posture in regard to administration in the junior college. These are the reactions of the interviewer as a consequence of the ten discussions and in examining the responses in retrospect. Some of the key comments may help to put the reaction of the whole in focus.

<u>On Merit Pay</u>

...feel I would be able to command the higher salaries in merit pay

...it is not the type of reward and punishment system that should be operating

...however, would prefer not to be involved in such a system

...do not wish to be involved in a popularity contest

...merit pay is unprofessional...difficult to administer...will create rigidity...hinder creativity

...if not meritorious should not be part of the staff

...other attractions and incentives

reputation of institution

reputation of colleagues

turnover of staff

intellectual and general growth

<u>On Systematic Evaluation</u>

...evaluation is inherent in the position of president

...evaluation is always taking place,..is expected

...time consuming...subjective

...have faith in my own ability to be objective in evaluating others but not too much in persons evaluating me

...must be positive and deisgned to improve

...requires confidence and trust in top administrator

...is at least 80 per cent subjective and should be based largely upon task assigned, efficiency, and knowledge.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the evidence gathered from the literature, the questionnaires, and the interviews, two conclusions are clearly apparent for the Board of Trustees of the Marin Junior College District:

1. A merit pay program would not be a satisfactory incentive to better administrative performance or to reward outstanding members of the administrative staff.
2. A systematic evaluation program could be of great value but careful consideration should be given to the philosophy behind such a program and the means by which it would be carried out.

Merit Pay

Searching through the literature has revealed that merit pay seems to have run its course in business and industry.[19] Most recently, in fact, the United Auto Workers Union practically assured the eventual death of merit pay with its demand for a guaranteed annual wage. An examination of the responses to the questionnaire used in this study further emphasizes that a program of merit pay would not be acceptable to the administration and faculty at College of Marin. As a means of determining the consistency in response of those who participated in the study, the following questions were asked of the data: 1) did those who stated that merit pay was "undesirable" or "highly undesirable" also state that it would not provide incentive for better performance, and, 2) did they also "not approve" the establishment of a program of merit pay? This seemed to be the case, and the

---

[19] Studies by Theodore Caplow. Principles of Organization. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964, p. 266, cause him to conclude "Subsequently, it became apparent that money is by no means the only incentive to which workers are sensitive." As to the most "attractive distribution of incentive payments" he maintains, "The puzzle is almost unsolvable."

consistency of response was further ascertained by generating special tables (see Appendix D) for both faculty and administrators.

The general consensus, it seems, is that the salary schedule should reflect the desire of the Board to obtain and retain a top level administrative staff. This then obviates the necessity for administrators to enter into unprofessional and unseemly competition for special increments which might indicate that administrators who fail to obtain it must necessarily be incompetent, or withholding the full use of potential talents. In effect, the faculty and administration at Marin seem to agree with one former company president who was disillusioned with incentive systems which failed and stated: "I believe that salary and opportunity for promotion are the major incentives that one ought to put before executives, and not disproportionate compensation."[20]

Should the Board feel inclined to pursue a program of merit pay for administrators, several aspects are presented here that warrant judicious consideration.

Consideration No. 1 - in order to be effective at all, merit pay must make a substantial difference in annual pay of the recipient. This is difficult to accomplish with the already strained resources available to a junior college. Further, as Caplow points out, "Steeply graded incentive payments are the most effective in the short run, but they disturb the congruence of status and wage."[21] This is to say, as Whyte affirms, "...in planning the introduction of an incentive system, management cannot afford to concentrate its attention on the problem

---

[20] What Makes An Executive? Report of a Round Table on Executive Potential and Performance. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955, p. 130

[21] Caplow, p. 267.

of motivating one particular group...alone."[22] As a result, the already recognized sense of conflict between faculty and administration could be intensified by inaugurating a program of merit pay for the administration independent of a similar program for faculty.

Consideration No. 2 - problems of morale are always of grave concern in any organization and multiply in proportion to its complexity. Certain loyalties are built into each administrator's staff, and threats to morale could be readily perceived with a merit pay program. To think that the award or denial of merit pay to an individual will remain secret is to be naive about the highly effective means of "informal communication" within an organization (more effective, incidentally, than the "formal" means devised for this highly important function). As a result of the distribution of the "news" there are several repercussions possible:

a. The "loyal" staff of an administrator who fails to be rewarded may resent the lack of recognition for achievement which they feel should be clearly perceived by all. Consequently, not only is the administrator "let down" but his co-workers are equally demoralized and the entire area of their concern may well suffer from their malaise.

b. The "unhappy" staff (regardless of reason) of an administrator who is rewarded with merit pay may resent such recognition when they feel that he is not meritorious but is, perhaps, "tyrannical" or "incompetent" in his working relations within the office. This implies a lack of desire to reward them for his success and

---

[22]William F. Whyte, "Human Relations Theory - A Progress Report," Harvard Business Review, Vol. xxiv, No. 5 (September-October, 1956), p. 128.

the possible entrenchment of what they consider to be an unsatisfactory relationship. (Certainly they can leave if they do not like it, but ample studies exist to demonstrate the real, though hidden costs, of turnover in personnel; as well as the implications behind too great a turnover regardless of the level of persons within the enterprise.)

Consideration No. 3 - the distance of the low and high levels of salary between each administrative strata must be significantly different to accomodate incentive increments with any meaningful substance. This could then accommodate the "status" problem, alluded to earlier, as it relates within the administrative staff. Otherwise, it is conceivable that a meritorious assistant dean, for example, could surpass within a two to three year period his immediate superior who was not awarded merit pay. The repercussions from this are rather obvious and lead to a further complexity for consideration.

Consideration No. 4 - if a man is not rewarded with merit pay it could mean one of two things: either he is performing at a "satisfactory" level which does not qualify for reward, or, he is at an "unsatisfactory" performance level. If it is because of the latter, does the institution keep him on despite the recognition that he is not of a desirable calibre (thus creating a "common denominator" that is less than satisfactory)?[23] Or, is he to be "punished" with "demerit" pay

---

[23]Such policies are sometimes construed as "money savers," and a note of caution is in this thought "...the educational and economic consequences of 'saving money' by employing less than excellent administrative officers can indeed be serious." The point is made by Archie R. Ayers and John H. Russell. Internal Structure: Organization and Administration of Institutions of Higher Education. Bulletin 1962, No. 9, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962, p. 16. Certainly this point applies to the total concept of attracting and retaining highly competent personnel in all categories and positions.

by maintaining his current salary without even scheduled increases—or even moved back one step?

Consideration No. 5 - is there, indeed, going to be a salary schedule at all? Or, would it be better to maintain a completely open-ended approach to starting salaries as well as increases? If so, how would such individualized patterns be administered? What type of men would it attract? What type of uncertainty does it introduce into budgets and projections? What type of uncertainty does it cause in people?

More considerations could readily be introduced into the discussion, of course, and some of these must have already occurred in the mind of the reader. The concerns introduced above are necessarily negative for it is the aspects of possible negative reactions which are to be overcome in any plan to introduce a program of consequence into an already complex organization. What are the threats to the desired goals of efficiency, effectiveness, increased morale and performance of the administrators to be involved? Equally important, what will be the effects (especially the human and more subtle ones) upon the overall organization and all personnel?

Recommendations

1. That the Board reject the idea of instituting a program of merit pay for administrators unless it a) inaugurates such a program for all personnel at the College, b) that such a program should have the obvious and near-unanimous consent of all constituent elements of the College, c) that salary schedules should be used as a base for annual increment but that overlap between levels be eliminated, d) that incentive awards be sufficient to be categorized as worthy of effort, and e) that eligibility for merit pay be withheld until the completion of three years of service. Alternately, merit pay could be withheld until a person has reached the top

of the schedule and there are no current opportunities for promotion, or, if the Board wishes, to retain obviously competent talent in the position of optimum competence and need.

2. Should the Board decide not to pursue a program of merit pay, it should concentrate the resources it would have used in such a program to establish a salary schedule which would attract and retain administrators of the highest quality. This would require a schedule which would be considered "highly competitive" on a statewide level and which would be re-examined continuously to maintain such an opinion. Further, that "other incentives" be considered, such as the ones to be discussed later in this section. A consideration of these incentives might be appropriate at this point in the report, but they are also so closely allied to the concern of systematic evaluation that it was thought best to hold back until completing the presentation on evaluation first.

Systematic Evaluation

The literature indicates that evaluation is a necessary and inherent function of all positions within an organization. Certainly there was consensus among the persons polled about the "desirability" of systematic evaluation. Once again a check for consistency of response was made to see if 1) those who felt evaluation was "desirable" or "highly desirable" also felt it would "encourage" administrators, and 2) if they also approved the establishment of a systematic program of evaluation. The data indicated this was so, and the special tables generated to test this conclusion verified this fact in the case of both faculty and administrator respondents (see Appendix E).

However, the comments in the writings of many careful students about the whole area of evaluation of executive performance are filled with words of caution. They cite the inherent dangers of "subjectivity," "rater bias," "authoritarianism," and especially the purpose or philosophy which underlies the evaluative process. No less concern was expressed by the respondents to the questionnaire. The methods to be employed, the person or persons responsible for evaluation, and the ways in which such evaluation would affect their future were dominant themes in both written and oral responses.

Simon[24] has already been quoted on this subject, and Walton further alludes to the difficulties of measuring the results of administrative decisions in education. He points out, "Although all administrative decisions are made on the basis of their efficacy to achieve certain ends—facts with values attached—it is often impossible to determine what has been accom-

---

[24]Simon, p. 47

plished."[25] Time, in other words, is an important factor in evaluation. Immediate results on some scale of efficiency are not the determinants of success. Brown clarifies this point in rather colorful terms:

> When the administrator acts, he must reckon with realities beyond himself, but those sitting in the safety of their box seats can pass a judgment on his acts unfettered by the emotions and events that led him to act as he did. Also, because the administrator's judgment is evaluated after the act, it is likely that additional facts will have become available. The observers will often have the wonderful advantage of perfect twenty-twenty hindsight and, somewhat as in bridge, one peek at the full hand will tell much more than two finesses.[26]

There can be little doubt that administrative actions and behavior will have long-run as well as short-run implications. However, evaluation is an on-going process and there is also little doubt that it is necessary within an institution which has high public "visibility" and high public accountability, two characteristics of the junior college which deserve constant attention. On what bases then, and by whom, is a systematic evaluation to be conducted? What are the desired qualities of administrators, what is the purpose for evaluation, what procedures should be followed, and which person or persons shall be responsible for the program?

---

[25] John Walton. Administration and Policy Making in Education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1959, p. 180 (Worth a special note, perhaps, is Walton's opening quote from The Testament of Beauty by John Bridges:

> "Our stability is but balance, and conduct lies in masterful administration of the unforeseen."

[26] Ray E. Brown. Judgment in Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966, p. 5.

Barnard's[27] leadership qualities are vitality and endurance, decisiveness, persuasiveness, responsibility, and intellectual capacity. Walton[28] implies, somewhat cynically, that actual selection of educational administration is based upon conservative criteria, such as "...good appearance, the ability to get along with people, interest in community affairs, and conformity in dress, manners, and ideas." He does not espouse these criteria and expresses rather, a concern that originality, creativity, and competence in intellectual matters are seldom used in the selection process, thus creating the public image of "...the safe, prudent, practical man who exemplifies stability." Sammartino[29] groups 20 variables under four headings: ability, integrity, industry, and professional background. Interestingly, he particularly notes that "In administration, everything depends on the man."[30]

The participants in this study (see pp. 22) , offered a number of criteria for an evaluation program and they have been summarized within the following groups: professional ability, communications, human relations, commitment and loyalty, and leadership ability.

These diverse, but somewhat similar patterns of administrative attributes, must be finally synthesized by the institution planning to inaugurate a systematic evaluation program. It would seem essential, though, that such a synthesis must be carefully founded on an explicit purpose, a reasonable procedure, and open responsibility for implementation.

---

[27]Chester I. Barnard. "The Nature of Leadership," Human Factors in Management, S. D. Hoslett, ed., New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946, pp. 23-26.

[28]Walton, pp. 60-61.

[29]Peter Sammartino. Multiple Campuses. Rutherford, N.J.: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 1964, pp. 18-20.

[30]Sammartino, p. 7.

Newman and Wolf both alluded to the fact that evaluation which is tied to a pay scale must be kept separate from an evaluation program which seeks to assist, develop and appraise the person being evaluated. Further, they recommended that evaluation serve as a means of close communication and for increasing staff morale. This appears to be the tenor of most articles on the subject, and was certainly the attitude of the majority of persons polled for this study. There was great concern on the part of some administrators who regarded it as a means by which they could learn "where I stand" in the minds of superiors and colleagues. They want a "positive" program of evaluation, in other words, and not one which is tied to a system of rewards and punishment.

Another top official participating in the Columbia Round Table, cited earlier, summed up the value of evaluation in even broader terms:

> "The mere fact that people think about other people and their qualities improves relationships. You not only raise questions about how people are performing, but also questions about how the organization as a whole is performing."[31]

In a college, the evaluation process resembles a circular continuum in which, formally or informally, everyone is really being evaluated. The students are measured by the faculty, the faculty by department heads and assistant deans, the assistant deans by the dean, the administrative staff by the president, the president by the board, and the board by the people of the community. It is this continuum, it seems, which should determine who should evaluate the administrative staff and how that evaluation should be conducted. Several respondents to the study recommended a representative committee to carry on the evaluation process as it involves the administra-

---

[31] What Makes An Executive?, p. 130.

tive staff, while less than half placed full responsibility on the chief administrative officer. The committee structure conjures up an unwieldy and complex process, however, and in some ways attenuates the relationship between the president and his "administrative team." In regard to the president, this comment by Nyquist has bearing here, for it speaks directly to the Board:

> How can effective educational leadership be evaluated? Here are some of the things we have considered: (1) possession and clear understanding of goals; (2) the effectiveness of working interrelationships with board members, and the reason for the effectiveness; (3) the chief executive officer's ability to pick good subordinates.[32]

If, then, the final responsibility of administrative decisions or actions is to fall upon the president it seems clear that the right to evaluate in those areas where he will be most effective should fall to him. He has recommended the administrators to the Board, either to bring them in or perpetuate their stay. To interject another person or group between the staff and the president is to tie his hands in daily action with them, dissipate his authority, denigrate his recommendation or non-recommendation of each before the Board, and to assure his own dismissal with some degree of rapidity and eventual certainty.

One-man evaluation, however, has its serious problems: can the evaluator remain objective with colleagues, with friends? Can he provide each

---

[32]Ewald B. Nyquist. "Insights from Organized Programs," in Raymond T. Howes (ed.) Toward Better Preparation of College and University Administrators, Washington, D.C., Association for Higher Education, 1964, p. 23.

administrator with "leeway" as Guest[33] puts it? Is he aware that "...stress can distress good judgment," in Brown's[34] terms? Will he be able to recognize the creative or innovative—even if it is not "the usual thing to do?" Will he be able to ward off " popularity contests?" Can he delegate with an open mind and a free hand?

The answers to many of these questions, of course, depend greatly upon the relationship that exists between the board and the chief administrator, as well as the president himself. First of all, the board must be cognizant of the role of the president as he interacts with staff. Rigid lines of authority, stereotyped organizational lines, and the "scientific management" concepts seem not at all suitable to the academic community (and in the current era of "human relations" management seem to have lost priority in business and industry as well).[35] Ayers and Russel wrote this way about the point:

> Informed, cooperative, dedicated, and resourceful administrators are more important than streamlined organization and procedure if successful administrative leadership is to be assured.[36]

---

[33]Robert H. Guest. Organizational Change: The Effect of Successful Leadership. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1962. (This is a case study of how a new manager was able to bring an automobile assembly plant from the worst position to the best position relative to five other plants in a $2\frac{1}{2}$ year period. It is significant for this study in that delegation of responsibility, a trusting rather than punitive approach, and "leeway to act" without constant dictation were elements in this success.)

[34]Brown, pp. 22-38, uses an entire chapter to discuss the inhibiting factor of "stress" upon the success of the administrator.

[35]For a discussion of the trend from "scientific" to "human relations" management see: Raymond E. Callahan. Education and the Cult of Efficiency Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.

[36]Ayers and Russel, p. 16.

Returning a moment to Sammartino, he continues the man-system discussion with this thought:

> It could almost be said that the system is secondary to the persons who are running it. Almost any system will work with the right administrator, and almost no system will work if the wrong person is managing things.[37]

Following this line of thought further, it would seem that the president's relationships with administrative staff and his evaluation processes will be largely dictated by his own relations with and evaluation by the board. Many authorities have commented on "styles of leadership," but there seems little doubt that even the most open-handed of administrators would soon become close-fisted in the face of inhibited and stressful relations with his board of trustees. His fears would become everyones fears; his inability to act would become everyones inability to act. Granted that the board must be concerned with the public interest, Millet recommends: "In the performance of this public interest function, the board of trustees will necessarily rely heavily upon the president of the college..."[38] He further adds, of course, that it is the board's responsibility to evaluate the administration, and if eventually dissatisfied has no alternative but to dismiss the president.

Before such evaluation, though, the board members must decide what type of president they wish. They should be especially aware that they have retained "...the first member of the faculty" as discussed by Corson,[39] and

---

[37] Sammartino, p. 7.

[38] John D. Millet. The Academic Community. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962, p. 185. (Millet's point on evaluation is also made in Boardsmanship, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1961, p. 53, in which "continuous evaluation is mentioned with ultimate responsibility to dismiss the superintendent.)

[39] John J. Corson. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960, p. 62.

as emphasized by the College of Marin faculty in a recent letter to the Board of Trustees relating to the selection of a new president. Is the president, then, to be "mechanic" or "philosopher" in Callahan's terms, whose function is "...not to determine what the schools /are/ to do, but rather how...to do what /he is/ told."[40] Callahan enlarges upon the vulnerability of the educator to pressure and contends that the pattern of criticism and response "...does not necessarily result in 'meeting' the needs of the community' and it often results in an abdication of responsibility for educational leadership."[41] Mayer reinforces this attitude when he points out "...when college leaders merely are guided by expediency and reflect only the wishes of their constituency, their institutions become places of stagnation."[42]

Returning for a moment to the literature of business and industry, Guest's conditions of effective authority are analogous here as he discusses successful leadership. He maintains the leader must be granted "leeway of action" by his superiors for he has a dual role to play as "agent of higher authorities and as representative of his organization to higher authorities." He needs "time perspective" so that he is not responding to emergencies, must set realistic goals, openly acknowledge interdependence, and integrate the ...requirements of the total organization with the immediate needs of subordinates.[43]

It is with all of the foregoing discussion in mind that recommendations

---

[40] Callahan, p. 84.

[41] Callahan, (preface).

[42] Frederick Mayer. Creative Universities. New York: College and University Press Publishers, 1961, p. 59.

[43] Guest, pp. 128-133.

are made about the systematic evaluation of administrators at College of Marin.

Recommendations

1. A systematic evaluation of the administrative staff should be instituted at the College of Marin, administered by the president, and apart from any system of merit or incentive pay.

2. The underlying philosophy of the program should be the development of a highly competent administrative team, the increase of morale, the encouragement of innovation and creativity in each member of the staff, and the continuous cooperative relations between all members of the staff.

3. The process of evaluation should not be of an objective "checklist" type, conducted at one or several specific times during the year. Rather, it should be continuous, informal, and of the critical-incident variety wherein comments to and notes about both the success and difficulties of the person evaluated are made after his completion of some assigned duty or project.

4. A confidential folder should be maintained on each member of the staff by the president in which the ongoing observations should be filed for annual summary and examination. The contents of these folders should be discussed before the Board only in cases of promotion or dismissal, but should be the basis for the president's annual recommendation for retention or dismissal of administrators.

5. The president should conduct this loosely formalized procedure in his own manner, but should keep in mind the following cautions:

   a. Maintain objectivity

   b. Avoid authoritarian demands for conformity to one style or approach

c. Maintain open and continuous dialogue rather than waiting for end-of-year discussion when incidents are fuzzy or forgotten

d. Delegate freely and avoid constraints on the individual

e. Permit disagreement in an agreeable atmosphere

f. Encourage open and continuous lines of communication to and among administrators

g. In all evaluation discussions maintain an attitude of helpfulness and offer suggestions for development

h. Throughout the evaluation process keep in mind the "Criteria for Evaluation" recorded on pp. 22 of this report.

Other Incentives

Perhaps one of the greatest incentives, other than a salary considered commensurate with responsibilities and duties, is the one of evaluation. Knowing where one stands is a freeing mechanism, especially when the entire climate is one of freedom from stress and fear generated by punitive or authorian dictates. In such a healthy environment ideas can flow and flourish, for as Bower points out, the low birth rate of ideas is caused by inertia, fear, futility, and lack of attention.[44] The elimination of "competitiveness" and the encouragement of open and professional relationships is essential to the innovative man and organization. Further, this permits risk-taking with total support. In a creative organization, the fault should not lie in failure but in not having tried at all.

Aside from "highly competitive" salaries and a constructive and encouraging evaluation program, what other incentives are essential to obtaining and retaining the very competent administrators desired at the College of Marin? The administrators, as well as faculty and presidents, who responded to the questionnaire offer positive suggestions here (see chart 14 on p. 24). Opportunity for development placed within the top three for all three segments with worthwhile activity close behind. For the administrators, they were actually one and two in order of priority. These two incentives, it would seem, verify most of the foregoing discussion. The administrator wants to develop as an administrator. If his ideas and recommendations are not permitted to flourish, if his creativity is stifled, and if he is expected to conform to rigid and authoritarian procedures at all times where is the development; what is worthwhile?

---

[44] Marvin Bower, "Nurturing Innovation in an Organization," in Gary Steiner (ed.), The Creative Organization, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965, pp. 170-172.

As a substantiating note to the two incentives above, the third place vote of the administrators (and the combined groups) was a "voice in their own affairs." As Corson has noted, "The individual, at least in a democratic society, continually aspires for the right to choose between alternatives...He gains a feeling of personal dignity and worthwhileness if he can influence those events which concern his being and his future."[45]

How can these incentives be turned into tangible programs? For one thing, in the administrators' relationships with the president who must himself feel these same incentives emanating through him from the board. All that has already been discussed relative to the evaluation process speak to these needs in concrete manner. Additionally, however, there are some positive programs that can be considered and should be studied by the administrative staff, the president, and the Board, some of which are already part of the College of Marin policies:

1. Attendance at conferences and programs that pertain to the individual
2. Adequate auxiliary personnel to free administrators from detail
3. Sufficient co-administrators to minimize excess burden on any one man
4. A resource and reference library for administrators and time to make use of it
5. A sabbatical program for additional study and change of pace from administrative duties
6. Reasonably attractive and well-ordered facilities in which to work.

---

[45]Corson, p. 7.

Summary

The fact that administrators are not tenured bears repetition here. It is doubtful that any of them would wish to change this policy. However, risk-taking automatically increases in direct proportion to responsibility. Administrators are a "high visibility" group within the institution. Any special program which singles them out only increases their distance from colleagues on the faculty with whom they must cooperate to achieve the goals of the college. This factor, together with the reaction of the questionnaire respondents, necessitates a recommendation that the College of Marin should not establish a merit pay program. Instead it should concentrate on a "highly competitive" salary schedule and other incentives.

Reactions to the concept of systematic evaluation of administrative staff were quite the opposite. A majority of respondents were in favor of such a program, and it qualifies also as another "incentive" to administrative performance. For these reasons, a systematic, but relatively informal, evaluation program is recommended along with the examination of other factors to increase the level of competency and morale of administrators.

It was difficult, however, to merely state the above-mentioned conclusions to the study without some discussion. Much has been written about the rapid growth of the junior college, its diversity of purpose, and its need to find a real identity. Every change contemplated in its policies and procedures seems to have major impact in times like these, especially as the change being considered related to particularized rewards for a particular segment within the colleges. This impact is even more significant within an individual junior college district which is soon planning to become a multi-campus district, attended by increased complexity, enlarged staff, and centralized administration.

It is hoped that the expanded discussion, as a consequence of research into much recent literature and findings on the subject, has helped by giving a philosophical as well as practical base to the final recommendations.

APPENDIX A

California Junior College Chief Administrators

COLLEGE OF MARIN
QUESTIONNAIRE
ON
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF
MERIT PAY AND EVALUATION

PART I - EVALUATION

1. Do you have a systematic means of evaluating administrative staff at your school?

   YES ☐ NO ☐

2. If YES:

   a) Who conducts the evaluation?

      ☐ Board of Trustees

      ☐ Chief Administrator

      ☐ Faculty Committee

      ☐ Other _____
      (Please name group and describe membership)

   b) Is an evaluation form used?

      YES ☐ NO ☐ (If yes, would you please enclose a copy.)

   c) What is your professional opinion of the current procedure?

      (1) Effective ☐

          Ineffective ☐

      (2) Efficient ☐

          Inefficient ☐

      (3) Builds morale of administrative staff ☐

          Does not build morale of administrative staff ☐

   d) Would you prefer to drop the procedure?

      YES ☐ NO ☐

   e) Would you encourage other schools to adopt a systematic evaluation program for administrative staff?

      YES ☐ NO ☐

3. If NO:

   a) Have you ever considered such a program?

      YES ☐ NO ☐

   b) Are you presently considering such a program?

      YES ☐ NO ☐

   c) Would you like to start such a program?

      YES ☐ NO ☐

4. If you would like to start such a program, who should conduct the evaluation?

   ☐ Board of Trustees

   ☐ Chief Administrator

   ☐ Faculty Committee

   ☐ Other _____
   (Please name group and describe membership.)

5. Please state briefly why you <u>would</u> or <u>would not</u> like to start such a program:

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

6. Regardless of your professional feelings about such a program, would you list at least three main criteria on which you feel evaluation of administrative staff should be based?

   a) _____

   b) _____

   c) _____

   d) _____

   e) _____

PART II - MERIT PAY

1. Does your college have a merit pay program for administrative staff?

   YES ☐ NO ☐

2. If yes, what is your reaction to the current program?

   a) Successful ☐

      Unsuccessful ☐

   b) Efficient ☐

      Inefficient ☐

   c) Encourages administrative staff ☐

      Does not encourage administrative staff ☐

   d) Other comments: _____

      _____

      _____

3. If you do not have a merit pay program would you endorse one at your school?

   YES ☐ NO ☐

4. Please give a brief reason for your response to No. 3:

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

5. How would you rate your existing administrative staff salary schedule?

   ☐ Highly competitive

   ☐ Not competitive

   ☐ Competitive

6. Part I of this questionnaire concerns evaluation of administrators. If you do have merit pay:

   a) Is an evaluation procedure part of the program?

   YES ☐ NO ☐

   b) If no evaluation procedure is involved, please state briefly how merit raises are administered:

   _____

   _____

   _____

7. What incentives, in your professional opinion, best motivate members of the administrative staff? Please use the items below as a check list, rating your responses in a 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., priority:

   ☐ Higher financial income

   ☐ Social status and respect

   ☐ Security

   ☐ Attractive work and environment

   ☐ Opportunity for development

   ☐ Worthwhile activity

   ☐ Personal power and influence

   ☐ Voice in his own affairs

   ☐ Just and diligent supervision

   ☐ Other _____

APPENDIX B

College of Marin Administrators and Faculty

COLLEGE OF MARIN
QUESTIONNAIRE
ON
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF
MERIT PAY AND EVALUATION

PART I - MERIT PAY

1. What is your reaction to merit pay for administrators:

   ☐ Highly desirable

   ☐ Desirable

   ☐ Undesirable

   ☐ Highly undesirable

   ☐ Indifferent

2. Please list any junior colleges you know where merit pay for administrators is currently a practice:

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. Do you feel that merit pay would act as an incentive to better administrative performance?

   YES ☐ NO ☐

4. Would you approve or disapprove of the adoption of merit pay at Marin?

   ☐ Approve

   ☐ Disapprove

5. How would you rate the existing administrative staff salary schedule at Marin:

☐ Highly competitive

☐ Not competitive

☐ Competitive

6. Part II of this questionnaire concerns evaluation of administrators. If Marin adopts merit pay:

a) Should an evaluation procedure be part of the program?

YES ☐ NO ☐

b) If no evaluation procedure should be involved, how should merit pay be administered?

_____

_____

_____

c) In your professional opinion, who should administer a merit pay schedule?

☐ Chief Administrator

☐ Board of Trustees

☐ Faculty Committee

☐ Other

PART II - EVALUATION

1. What is your reaction to the evaluation of administrative staff:

   ☐ Highly desirable

   ☐ Desirable

   ☐ Undesirable

   ☐ Highly Undesirable

   ☐ Indifferent

2. Please list any junior colleges you know where evaluation of administrators is currently a practice:

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. In your professional opinion, would an evaluation program encourage or discourage administrative staff:

   ☐ Encourage

   ☐ Discourage

4. Would you approve or disapprove of an evaluation program for administrators at Marin?

   ☐ Approve

   ☐ Disapprove

5. Please give a brief reason for your answer to No. 4:

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

6. If an evaluation program were established at Marin, who should administer it:

- ☐ Chief Administer
- ☐ Board of Trustees
- ☐ Faculty Committee
- ☐ Other

7. Regardless of your attitude about such a program, would you list at least three main criteria on which you feel evaluation of administrative staff should be based:

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. What incentives, in your professional opinion, best motivate members of the administrative staff? Please use the items below as a check list, rating your responses in a 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., priority:

- ☐ Higher financial income
- ☐ Social status and respect
- ☐ Security
- ☐ Attractive work and environment
- ☐ Opportunity for development
- ☐ Worthwhile activity
- ☐ Personal power and influence
- ☐ Voice in his own affairs
- ☐ Just and diligent supervision
- ☐ Other _____

APPENDIX C

Questions posed to students in the Junior College Leadership Program at the University of California (Berkeley), and their responses

1. Would you apply for a position on the administrative staff of a junior college where a merit pay program based upon a systematic evaluation procedure was in effect?

2. Would you apply for the position of president of a junior college where the Board of Trustees would require that the president administer a merit pay program based upon a systematic evaluation procedure?

JCLP - I

I. Yes

1. If the gulf between highest faculty salary and lowest administrator salary was acceptable to begin with.
2. Concern for the bases of procedure - factors involved in judgment.
3. Who does evaluation - immediate superior ok - not board, not faculty
4. Could cause conformity to superior's point of view and style
5. Other incentives would be time, colleagues, reputation, condition, challenge.

II. Yes

1. As long as president sets up the procedure to be followed.
2. Everyone is aware that evaluation is going on regardless.

I. Might

1. I question the ability to administer such a program.
2. Naturally assume I will be evaluated but not in relation to merit pay.
3. The job description should permit initiative within a policy framework. How do you assess initiative?
4. Merit pay forces the formalizing of a series of subjective evaluations which are contingent upon pressures of individual situations and are not conducive to comparison.
5. Every person works differently and this must be taken into account.

II. No

1. Would not wish to administer such a program.
2. In view of the diverse functions in an institution, the measure of competence for each position demands too broad a base of expertise. Expectation could be divorced from reality and this then puts decision-making at multiple levels and these must be resolved and the focus then is upon the chief administrator.

As a result, you are in a situation where a great amount of time is involved for a rather minute amount of money. Yet the ego involvement of each candidate is optimum. Too much attention is placed on financial return rather than other rewards, such as:

1. Time - for professional growth with opportunities for study, sabbaticals, etc.
2. Instructional resources - library, clerical staff, audio-visual equipment.

JCLP - III

I. Yes - qualified

1. The institution's reputation would draw me initially.

2. The way in which merit pay is based on evaluation is critical - what climate is created? what is the attitude of administrators - turnover?

3. Not convinced of the concept of merit pay. The aim of the institution is to have the most able people and merit pay is a tacit implication that inferior persons will be retained at lesser salaries.

II. No

1. Either the board is seeking the most able or it is not - same as #3 above. It is not the type of reward and punishment system that should be operating.

2. Other incentives are:

   a. increased responsibility - freely delegated

   b. upward mobility

   c. greater autonomy

3. As president I feel the climate created would hinder creativity and develop a competition which would deter productivity.

4. Procedures for selecting administrators is called into question here for should relate to evaluation.

JCLP - IV

I. A qualified <u>no</u>

1. Cannot conceive of a workable system

2. Evaluation is overt and involved

3. There must be a philosophy of evaluation that obtains for student, faculty and administration.

   It must be <u>positive</u> and designed to <u>improve</u> the person evaluated; not negative and designed to determine status and "bread-and-

butter" needs which make it self-defeating.

Alternative incentives

1. Quality of colleagues
2. Congenial environment
3. Intellectual and general growth - encouraged to undertake new programs and try new methods in existing programs without penalty.

II. A qualified no

1. As chief administrator would not accept a situation which would affect own ability to succeed.

JCLP - V

I. Yes

1. This is not a critical issue to me for it has been a great part of my past.
2. However, would prefer not to be involved in such a program.
3. Other things would affect my decision more:
   a. Attitude of community towards college
   b. Location of college
   c. Reputation of college and staff

II. No

1. It would be impossible to administer.
2. It would ultimately fall on the shoulders of the president.
3. Would not care to be chief administrator at a college where the hottest issue is one on which I would disagree with the board or principle.

4. Evaluation, however, is inherent in the position of president and must be a part of his responsibility.

JCLP - VI

I. Yes

1. Doesn't make any difference as a factor
2. Other factors:
   a. individual administrators
   b. open mind
   c. philosophy
   d. general acceptance of new ideas
3. Expect to do a certain job and expect evaluation

II. Yes

1. Personally feel best merit is the consistency of the program.
2. The program must be well laid out and clear.
3. Diaster in past efforts has been to drop temporarily the program once started in order to economize in a given year.

JCLP - VII

I. Yes

1. I feel I would be able to command the higher salaries under merit pay. It doesn't frighten men and I have confidence of success.
2. If merit is based upon an ingratiating concept then it is bad.
3. Have several criticism about merit system in education:
   a. How will evaluation be conducted?

b. Will creat rigidity for it will single out certain behavior which will "pay off." These may be undesirable and eliminate breadth and ideals in behavior and search for change. Will attenuate desire for change and innovation.

II. Yes.

1. I feel that I could put merit pay to work profitably - able to look to those areas of progress in others.
2. Do not trust others to accomplish it but do trust myself.
3. It does imply rewards and punishments but I would avoid the punitive aspects.
4. It would and must penetrate the lock-step in education. But, you must have the best person possible at the top to make these decisions.
5. Requires confidence and trust in top administrator and this is too often sadly lacking.

JCLP - VIII

I. No (Probably not)

1. Although it doesn't make a great deal of difference to me much depends on who administers and how it is done. Will the board, the president, faculty, or students evaluate fro merit?
2. Do not wish to be part of a popularity contest in relation to faculty - (assumes faculty evaluation of administrator).
3. If administrator is not meritorious he should not be part of staff.
4. Evaluation is certainly aceeptable but is difficult to translate into a financial amount. It takes place at every meeting the administrator attends everytime he speaks to a group.
5. Evaluation is inherent every time you present, meet or report.

II. Yes

1. However, would be less apt to seek it although would not rule it out.
2. Have faith in my own ability to be objective in evaluating others but not too much in persons evaluating me.
3. Cannot envision a system that is rational or would work for there are too many subjective decisions to be made by chief administrator.
4. Merit pay works only when the people involved have decided that this is what they want.

JCLP - IX

I. Yes

1. Comfortable with idea of merit pay and evaluation.
2. Why be held to schedule geared to mediocre or average?
3. Evaluation is built into any position in any walk of life.

II. Yes

1. Chief administrator makes value judgments every day about many issues and many persons.
2. The same reasons mentioned for question I also obtain here.
3. Evaluation is at least 80 per cent subjective and should be based largely upon task assigned, efficiency, and knowledge.

JCLP - X

I. No

1. Prefer not to worry about level of livelihood being affected by a committee or individual.

2. Merit Pay has inherent difficulties and a flat contract for administrator is the only solution
3. Down to haggling for salary if it is chief administrator only
4. As administrator you are bound to offend - cannot be afraid of being bad guy
5. Assume evaluation under any circumstance and should be done
6. Merit Pay is unprofessional.

II. No

1. Ideally as chief administrator must have freedom to select the administrative staff
2. They should be considered as flexible - even expendable - but based on a good salary schedule
3. Man creates his own job - hired for a loosely defined position and must be free to carry the ball and develop it
4. Other incentives - commitment to junior college and to what it could do and should do; freedom to do something significant with position.

APPENDIX D

2 x 2 Comparison Tables

RESPONSES TO MERIT PAY QUESTIONS

Administrators
(N = 11)

	Desirable	Undesirable	
Incentive	1	0	= 1
Not Incentive	1	6	= 7
		No or Qualified	= 3
		Total	11

Faculty
(N = 11)

	Desirable	Undesirable	
Incentive	1	1	= 2
Not Incentive	1	7	= 8
		No Response	= 1
		Total	11

	Desirable	Undesirable	
Approve	1	0	= 1
Disapprove	0	8	= 8
		No or qualified	= 2
		Total	11

	Desirable	Undesirable	
Approve	1	0	= 1
Disapprove	1	9	= 10
			—
		Total	11

	Incentive	Not Incentive	
Approve	1	1	= 2
Disapprove	0	6	= 6
		No or qualified	= 3
		Total	= 11

	Incentive	Not Incentive	
Approve	1	0	= 1
Disapprove	1	8	= 9
		No Response	= 1
		Total	= 11

APPENDIX E

2 x 2 Test Tables

RESPONSES TO EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Administrators (N = 11)

	Approve	Disapprove	
Desirable	7	1	= 8
Undesirable	0	2	= 2
		No Response	= 1
		Total	11

Faculty (N = 11)

	Approve	Disapprove	
Desirable	6	0	= 6
Undesirable	0	5	= 5
		Total	11

	Approve	Disapprove	
Encourage	5	0	= 5
Discourage	0	3	= 3
		No Response	= 3
		Total	= 11

	Approve	Disapprove	
Encourage	5	0	= 5
Discourage	0	4	= 4
		No Response	= 2
		Total	= 11

	Desirable	Undesirable	
Encourage	5	0	= 5
Discourage	1	2	= 3
		No Response	= 3
		Total	= 11

	Desirable	Undesirable	
Encourage	5	0	= 5
Discourage	0	4	= 4
		No Response	= 2
		Total	= 11

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Administrative Staff, College of Marin. Merit Pay Proposal, submitted to the Board of Trustees, May 25, 1966.

Ayers, Archie R. and John H. Russell, Internal Structure: Organization and Administration of Institutions of Higher Education Bulletin 1962, No. 9, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962, p. 16

Barnard, Chester I. "The Nature of Leadership," Human Factors in Management, S. D. Haslett, ed., New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946, pp. 23-26.

Bower, Marvin. "Nurturing Innovation in an Organization," in Gary Steiner (ed.), The Creative Organization, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965, pp. 170-172.

Bright, John. News report on special study for CTA.

Brown, Roy E. Judgment in Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966, p. 5; pp. 22-38.

Callahan, Raymond E. Education and the Cult of Efficiency, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Caplow, Theodore. Principles of Organization. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964, p. 266.

Caplow, Theodore. What Makes An Executive? Report of a Round Table on Executive Potential and Performance. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955, p. 130.

College of Marin Administrative Regulations in process of Revision.

Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960, pp. 7, 62.

Guest, Robert H. Organizational Change: The Elements of Successful Leadership. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1962.

Kornhauser, William, Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodation, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963.

Lincoln, James F. Lincoln's Incentive System, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1946.

Marcson, S. The Scientist in American Industry. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, Industrial Relations Section, 1960.

Mayer, Frederick. Creative Universities. New York: College and University Press Publishers, 1961, p. 59.

Millet, John D. The Academic Community. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962, p. 185.

Newman, William H. Administrative Action. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956, pp. 449, 450.

Nyquist, Ewald B. "Insights from Organized Programs," in Raymond T. Howes (ed.) Toward Better Preparation of College and University Administrators, Washington, D.C., Association for Higher Education, 1964, p. 23.

Sammartino, Peter Multiple Campuses. Rutherford, N.J.: Farleigh Dickson University Press, 1964, pp. 7, 18-20.

Sibson, Robert E. "Plan for Management Salary Administration" in Management of the Personnel Function. (Heckmann and Huneryager ed.) Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1962, pp. 340-364.

Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behavior. New York: The Free Press, 1957, p. 47.

Steffensen, James P. Merit Salary Programs, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962, p. 8.

Vollmer, H. "Professionals and Organizations," in a lecture at Stanford Research Institute, Palo Alto, California, July 12, 1966.

Vollmer, H. A Preliminary Investigation of the Role of Scientists in Research Organizations, Boston, Mass.: Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, 1963, and others.

Walton, John Administration and Policy-Making in Education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1959, pp. 60-61, 180.

What Makes An Executive?, p. 130

Whisler, Thomas and Harper, Shirley (eds.). Performance Appraisal. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1962.

Whyte, William F. "Human Relations Theory - A Progress Report," Harvard Business Review, Vol. xxiv, No. 5 (September-October, 1956), p. 128.

Wolf, William B. The Management of Personnel. San Francisco: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1961.